



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

glitter of his verse, for instance—are not so easy to come at. The Senecan *steichomutheia* is but faintly reproduced by Dr. Miller, for example, in the famous “*Medea superest*” colloquy with the Nurse, or in the wordy warfare between Megara and Lycus in the *Hercules Furens*. The choruses again are not very successfully rendered in unrhymed reproductions of the original meters. Dr. Miller is happier in his occasional substitution of rhymed measures, as in the *Troades* 371–408, from which a few lines may be quoted:

When in the tomb the dead are laid,
When the last rites of love are paid;
When eyes no more behold the light,
Closed in the sleep of endless night;
Survives there aught, can we believe?
Or does an idle tale deceive?

The translator would have done well to adopt this method more extensively, though it is no doubt unreasonable to ask anyone to do for Seneca what Mr. Gilbert Murray is doing for Euripides. Dr. Miller has given us something less than this, but something for which we may still be grateful. His tabulated comparison of the tragedies with their Greek originals and his mythological index will be useful to students, and there is an excellent introductory essay by Professor Manly on Seneca's influence on early English tragedy, of which the only complaint to be made is that it is too short.

JOHN W. CUNLIFFE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

The Vocabulary of High-School Latin. By GONZALEZ LODGE. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1907. Pp. viii + 215. \$1.50.

Professor Lodge's *Vocabulary of High School Latin* will, no doubt, be warmly welcomed by many teachers of Latin. It paves the way admirably to a successful use of the general lexicon.

The book has three parts: an introduction which treats of the formation of words; a vocabulary of words that occur in Latin ordinarily read in high schools; and a list of the words of the vocabulary in the order in which they occur in the authors as they are usually read.

The formation of words is well treated. The suffixes, with their meanings, are so presented that the examples are comprehended at a glance. A few unimportant slips occur. E. g., in § 55*b* the statement is made that adverbs are formed by adding *-ter* to the stems of adjectives of the third declension. One of the examples is *prūden-ter*. According to the rule it would be *prudent-ter*. In § 18 would it not be more accurate to derive *servitium* from *servus*?

The object of the vocabulary is to set forth the words used in high-school Latin so as to enable pupils to learn one thousand words by the end of the Caesar year, five hundred more by the end of the Cicero year, and five hundred more

by the end of the Virgil year, two thousand in all. The method suggested in the preface for learning these two thousand words savors of the mechanical. Many will question the value of the plan.

The vocabulary presents an attractive appearance. The quality of the paper, the type, and the arrangement combine to make a beautiful page. The writer would prefer to have all the defined words printed in type of the same size. Should not a pupil be enabled to find a word that occurs fewer than five times as easily as he finds one that occurs more than five times?

The definitions are carefully graded, without superfluous meanings, from the literal meaning to that which the defined word has in the text.

The third part of the book will prove of great convenience for those teachers who desire to have their pupils learn from day to day the meanings of the new words of the next lesson.

It is regrettable that a book, otherwise scholarly and attractive, should be marred by numerous inaccuracies and inconsistencies. The following are noted:

If long vowels are marked at all, why not mark all, especially those about which there is no doubt? E. g., final *ō*. From Professor Lodge's book pupils will get the impression that final *o* in verbs and nouns is short. They will conclude that in *ego*, *duo*, and *amo*, the quantities of final *o* are the same.

Observe the following: *ingredior*; *tibi*, and yet *mihi*; *sāl*; *anteā*, and yet *postea*; *transcurro*; *vetitum* (supine of *veto*); *praestō*, but elsewhere in verbs final *o* not marked. Why mark final *o* in prepositions, conjunctions, and adverbs, but not in verbs? E. g., *prō*, *quandō*, *ultrō*.

The principal parts of *injerō*, as given, would be: *infero*, (*in*)*ferre*, (*in*)*tulī*, (*in*)*lātum*. Why should only the "rubrics" have the long vowels marked?

Why should not the gender of all nouns be given? Why give the gender of *agricola*, and not of *vulgus*, *crinis*, *cor*, *sāl*, *manus*, *diēs*, etc.?

Is the supine of *fungō*, *finctum*? the perfect indicative of *fluō*, *fluī*; the supine of *torqueō*, *torsum*? Has not *occurrō* usually the perfect *occurri*? See also other compounds of *currō*. The principal parts of *afferō*, as given, would be: *affero*, (*af*)*ferre*, (*af*)*tulī*, (*af*)*lātum*. Has *complūrēs* no neuter? Is "quite a number," a meaning of *complūrēs*, good English? Has not *revellō* in the perfect, *revellī*? "Typographical errors," no doubt, is the answer to some of the above queries. Moreover—"la critique est aisée, et l'art est difficile."

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN